



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The episodes I have related are, I believe, characteristic. Several points stand out. We notice, of course, the utter selfishness of the rich. The closest parallel to the appropriation of coal lands, water power sites, etc., is the creation of the *latifundia*, existing for private, not for public, profit, and using resources which, according to some, should belong to the people as a whole. On the other hand, the withdrawal of these large areas from cultivation finds its closest analogue in the creation of forest reserves and national parks—the things on which the conservationist most prides himself. Of the industrial aspects of conservation the Roman was happily ignorant. Most important of all, in my judgment, is the fact that the conservation problem was largely and increasingly political. Like the refusal of the tribunes to permit levies (Livy 3.53.5, etc.), the threat of agrarian laws was a political weapon, used for political effect, and treated as such by the aristocrats, who replied with the charge that the tribunes were trying to overthrow the government. The disagreement of tribunes shows the political character of the agitation; so does the willingness of the commons to accept bribes from the senate in the form of colonies (Livy 4.51.5). The commons were not much interested in the problem as an economic issue. It is true that apparently the Younger Gracchus and Caesar had little difficulty in securing colonists, but the 'back to the farm' sentiment was by no means universal. The surest way to discourage an attempt to redivide the public land was to suggest sharing it with the allies. How great a part politics played may be seen from the account of the siege of Veii (Livy 5.2.2 ff.), where the tribunes maintained that the siege was continued through the winter simply to keep the commons away from home. That conscience was a minor factor may be seen from the following narrative (Livy 3.71.3 ff.): Aricia and Ardea appealed to the Roman people to arbitrate a dispute as to a certain piece of land. An aged plebeian named Scaptius arose in the assembly and stated that the real owner had been Corioli, and that he in his youth had helped win it in war from that town. Thereupon, though, or because, the consuls and the senate objected, the assembly voted to keep the land itself.

Here, perhaps, is the most important lesson for us. Nothing could show more clearly than the Roman experience the danger of making of conservation an issue of party politics. There are some things in our favor. Our problem is more complex than was that of the Romans, but we do not have to deal with slavery. Our situation is not yet so desperate, individually, as was that of the Roman of the republic. Let us see that it does not become so. The area of our country is so vast that monopoly has so far been almost impossible. Fortunately, we have not seen the shameless exploitation of the provinces which was the reproach of the Roman Republic. The experience of the Romans may teach us at least the danger of a selfish and unconsidered policy of any kind. We may have to settle the

conservation problem by political methods, but we need not and should not make it a partisan issue. If we do, we shall be helping to draw the same lines that divided the parties in ancient Rome.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH.

EVAN T. SAGE.

### THE PHILADELPHIA SOCIETY FOR THE PROMOTION OF LIBERAL STUDIES<sup>1</sup>

The Philadelphia Society for the Promotion of Liberal Studies, which was organized on March 14 last, held its second gathering in the auditorium of the Houston Club, on the evening of Thursday, October 15. Over two hundred members and friends of the Society were present, and the membership was considerably increased; it numbers now nearly three hundred.

Professor Walter Dennison, of Swarthmore College, President of the society, presided and opened the meeting. He said in part:

This is the second meeting of the Society, and is the first of a series of meetings which we intend to hold this winter in the furtherance of the purposes of the Society. That purpose is to promote the liberal studies; and by liberal studies we mean not merely Greek and Latin, but all of the old-time subjects—mathematics, philosophy, history, modern languages, English, and the natural sciences. We are to make an earnest effort to prevent the encroachment of the so-called newer studies upon the field of the older ones, not because they are to be condemned as undesirable or as inferior, but because we believe that they do not offer an adequate substitute for the older studies in the training of the mind and intellect, however excellent they may be from some standpoints. We propose, therefore, to wage an aggressive fight for the extension of the influence of those studies, the liberal studies as they are denominated, by which many generations of men have been intellectually trained.

Dr. Talcott Williams, Director of the School of Journalism, Columbia University, delivered an eloquent and inspiring address of which the following is an abstract:

Twenty years ago I made, before the Association of Colleges and Preparatory Schools of the Middle States and Maryland, a plea for liberal studies in College entrance requirements. I spoke then as a newspaper man who believed these studies indispensable to a sound education. I speak now, still a newspaper man, upon the relation of these studies to the work of the journalist.

The central task of a School of Journalism is the training of the writer. There are many writers who are not journalists; there are some journalists who are not writers—they are rare. Some share in the divine gift of expressing adequately fact, argument, opinion in the written word is indispensable to the success of the journalist. No man has ever won supreme success in the calling without it. The question in the training of the journalist in the mind of the newspaper man is, whether writing can be taught at all except by the work of writing.

Much else the School of Journalism must do. It must give its students, as Mr. Joseph Pulitzer pointed out, a sound knowledge of the history of their own day.

<sup>1</sup>This account is condensed from a report in the Old Penn Weekly Review.

It must make the structure of society known to its graduates. They must understand political institutions; they must be familiar with literature; at least one modern language must be theirs. Some knowledge of the principles of law must be theirs. A full acquaintance with the just limits of the Law of Libel must be theirs. But when this is all done, unless the newspaper man can write, he is as a man dumb among the blind, without even a sign by which he can make himself known.

The practical result of a grapple with this problem in two years of academic work and one-half year before of anxious preparation and organization is that I speak here looking to the special relation of liberal studies to the work and training of newspaper men as well as to the wider influence of this sphere of education. Since I spoke twenty years ago, in the midst of a great conflict in American education over liberal and practical studies, the battle has been fought and lost, so far as liberal studies are concerned in the wide arena of training. Substantially all Colleges then required liberal studies as a requisite for a degree. Substantially all Colleges now accept for their degrees of many sorts, and even for the degree of Bachelor of Arts, practical studies which have their liberal side, but are not included under the generic term of 'liberal studies'. Once all studies, at the opening of the Renaissance, were alike liberal and practical. The learning of the world, its knowledge, its science, its inspiration, sacred and secular, were all in Greek or in Latin. Under the stimulus of their literature and their record, discovery began. As science grew, it gained a larger and larger empire in the field of education. The old learning ceased to contain the science of the world. Broadly speaking, the old learning came to stand for the inspiration of humanity in the greater monuments of letters and the new for the expanding knowledge of humanity in its environing conditions.

The work of the newspaper necessarily deals with these environing conditions. The newspaper man must know them or he is lost, and his work is of no effect. Society has become a vast complex, in which it is no longer possible to depend upon the individual knowledge gained through association and action with men, in the small cities of a sparsely settled country. The journalist instead must see the world as it is, and know yesterday, that yesterday of which so little is written in history, so that he can see the forces which affect to-morrow.

The School of Journalism, of which I have the honor to be the Director, has a four years' course. This is all too short for the knowledge necessary to the journalist. The difficulty under which the School daily labors is the task of weaving into the acquisition of knowledge the technical capacity to express this knowledge effectively. Unless the journalist can do this, all he has learned is ore in the hill. If he has learned to do this, the ore has been forged into a sword for the battle of humanity and for leadership of society. The principal difficulty which faces the School in the discharge of this task is that its students who come from the High School or who enter on advanced standing from other Colleges are without either the training or the inspiration which awakens in a man the capacity to write, by making him familiar with the monuments of the past, whether in his own tongue or in the classical languages. In the High School and the College it is alike true, that the student has been steadily acquiring all the various forms of the new learning and he has had little which gives him either the conception of style or the practical skill in the use of language which will make the written word in his hands inspiring, convincing or illuminating.

The 'English' which those who have had four years of training in the High School write is lamentable.

Men who have had one, two, three and sometimes four years in our Colleges are without knowledge of the first principles by which the writer must be guided. They understand less how a fact must be recorded, an opinion expressed, an argument made convincing, or an event touched with imagination than those who have been through the drill of the city-room and the news-desk. These are the practical results which accompany the great change in our education in the last forty years, which has supplanted the old learning by the new.

Fortunately, while the study of Latin has greatly decreased in our Colleges as compared with twenty to forty years ago, and Greek, save here and there, is taken by so few that in one College of the first rank (Yale) it was not possible to award the Greek prizes, the study of Latin in our Secondary Schools has greatly increased. In 1890 a little more than one-third (34.69 per cent) studied Latin. In our public High Schools, for the past ten years, this number has reached 50 per cent. This army of High School students, reaching 550,000 in 1912, or, including public and private schools, 620,000, constitutes the largest array of youth studying an ancient tongue ever gathered under the national system of schools in any land. Such improvement as has come in the English written in our High Schools is, I believe, due to this cause. It is at all events the experience of the School of Journalism that those who have a classical education write better than those who are without it. The School urges in preparatory training the combination of Latin and a foreign language. It gives an opportunity to continue the Classics for two years. Unable to secure, owing to the present condition of the problem with which it deals, and the time which it has, more attention to the monuments of ancient tongues, it has added a course for the reading of Shakespeare, the King James version of the Bible, and the greater letters of English. Observation and experience have made it perfectly clear that the training of the writer rests on the imitation and inspiration of models of style as it does on the patient training of the teacher.

The students bursting in a surging tide last June the flood-gates of all our institutions, eightfold more numerous in our Secondary Schools, fourfold more numerous in our higher education than forty years ago, have a training in science, in modern languages, in all the fields of economic and social study so far superior to that of their predecessors that a comparison is scarcely possible, but they are without the precise sense of literary force, that reverent conscientiousness of the past, and that vision of wisdom correcting and inspiring the light of common day which was the possession of those who had studied the old curriculum of Greek, Latin and Mathematics.

## REVIEW

Die Odyssee als Dichtung und ihr Verhältnis zur Ilias.  
By Carl Rothe. Paderborn: Ferdinand  
Schoeningh (1914). Pp. x + 360. Mk. 5.40.

This book appeared in just a little over three years after its now famous companion volume, *Die Ilias als Dichtung*, by the same author (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 4:134-135). What a mass of Homeric books has appeared in this short interval! Shewan, Allen, Lang, Leaf, Van Leeuwen, Spiess, Dachs, Belzner, Roemer, Roessner, Stuermer, Draheim, Drerup, Laurand, Champault, Ludwig, and many others have contributed telling arguments for Homeric unity. I